DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 976 EA 022 478

AUTHOR Dunlap, Diane M.; Goldman, Paul
TITLE "Facilitative" Power in Special Education and Clinical Supervision.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Authoritarianism; Decentralization; Elementary Secondary Education; *Participative Decision Making; *Power Structure; *School Restructuring; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Empowerment; *Facilitator Styles

ABSTRACT

The concept of power, fundamental to understanding human interactions and institutions, remains puzzling, elusive, theoretically complex, and largely unexamined by practitioners. A school restructuring agenda that purportedly changes power relationships in schools is being proposed and tested throughout the country. Basic questions are being asked about top-down power, and terms such as "power sharing," "empowerment," and "site-based management" embody hopes and expectations for improving school performance. These discussions rarely consider the underlying assumptions affecting power relationships among the practitioner/actors involved in decision-making. Attempting to reconsider the dominant sociological theories explaining power in schools, this paper argues that facilitative power, an alternative to traditional (authoritarian) interpretations of power in organizations, more accurately describes how power is exercised in school settings. Facilitative, interactive power can become increasingly common in settings where no single individual or role commands decision-making control without dependence on expert knowledge and cooperation among colleagues. Facilitative power enlarges decision-making and encourages nonstandardized approaches to problem-solving. Specific examples include the individualized educational program process in special education and current clinical supervision practices. These demonstrate the limitations of traditional power concepts and the usefulness of facilitation for capturing the essential nature of interactions among principals and both professional and nonprofessional staff. (57 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Dunlap
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED325976

"FACILITATIVE" POWER IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Diane Dunlap & Paul Goldman
Department of Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97405-1215
(503) 346-5077

Abstract

In this article, the authors argue that understanding facilitative aspects of organizational power has become necessary for analyzing processes and outcomes in today's schools. Facilitative, interactive power has become increasingly common in settings where no single individual or role commands decision-making control without dependence on expert knowledge and cooperation of colleagues. Specific examples of such situations include the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) process in special education aand current practices in clinical supervision. These demonstrate the limitations of traditional concepts of power and the usefulness of facilitation for capturing the essential nature of professional interactions between principals, staff, and non-professionals in schools.

EA 022 478

"FACILITATIVE" POWER IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Abstract

In this article, the authors argue that understanding facilitative aspects of organizational power has become necessary for analyzing processes and outcomes in today's schools. Facilitative, interactive power has become increasingly common in settings where no single individual or role commands decision-making control without dependence on expert knowledge and cooperation of colleagues. Specific examples of such situations include the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) process in special education aand current practices in clinical supervision. These demonstrate the limitations of traditional concepts of power and the usefulness of facilitation for capturing the essential nature of professional interactions between principals, staff, and non-professionals in schools.

"FACILITATIVE" POWER IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND CLINICAL SUPERVISION

I. Introduction: Facilitative and Authoritative Power

The most recent educational reform movement has begun to change how power is exercised in schools. Academic theories about power in organizations have not anticipated these changes. We in academe continue to characterize power primarily as a vertical system of authority that is grounded largely on formal organizational roles. For example, most research in educational administration describes how leaders (usually principals and superintendents) exercise power from the top down, simultaneously managing and leading, coaching and evaluating. Even where these leaders do not visibly exercise power or influence over others, activities of others are directed towards them as decision-makers, problem solvers, and as providers of organizational legitimacy and reward.

Bertrand Russell (1938: 1) called power the "fundamental concept in social science" just as energy is the fundamental concept in physics. Power within ourselves and power over others has fascinated scholars throughout human history. Yet, this concept, fundamental to understanding human interactions and institutions, remains puzzling, maddeningly elusive, theoretically complex, enigmatic, and largely unexamined by practitioners. Theories about power were largely developed to explain military and political phenomena. Only later were they

applied to the business settings from which writers about educational organization have incorporated the assumption that power flows vertically.

An agenda of school restructuring that purportedly changes power relationships in schools is being proposed and tested throughout the country (Lewis, 1989; Murphy, 1990; O'Neil, 1990). This reform rhetoric has forced us to align some old realities to new expectations. Basic questions are being asked about top-down power. Increasingly, such terms as "power sharing," "empowerment," and "site-based management" embody hopes and expectations for improving school performance through changes in power relationships. These discussions, however, rarely consider the underlying assumptions about power relationships between various actors involved in decision-making.

Regardless of whether underlying assumptions about power are understood by practitioners, a reading of prescriptive rhetoric and reported empirical research indicates that principals', teachers', and superintendents' actions and expectations have theories of power built into them. For example, administrators have been described as coordinators, as circulators of information, as boundary spanners, and as conflict resolvers (Pitner, 1982). They do planning and scheduling and some budgeting. They spend little time in classrooms. Hanson (1985) argues teachers and administrators cede specific responsibilities to one another while other areas become "contested spheres." The

tension between facilitative and authoritative approaches to power is likely to be most evident in these spheres.

Our observations of and experience in multiple school site programs has led us to reconsider the dominant sociological theories typically used to explain power in schools. In this paper we argue that facilitative power, an alternative to traditional interpretations of power in organizations, more accurately describes how power is exercised in school settings. Power as a "system of facilitation" is characterized by mutuality and synergy within the structured organizational setting of public schools. We develop the argument by presenting and critiquing the authoritative emphasis in writings about power. We then introduce, and dismiss, participatory and libertarian approaches to power. We argue that educational reform, with increasing emphasis on collaboration and professionalism, makes a new approach particularly appropriate for interpreting what actually occurs in many K-12 districts, schools, and classrooms. To explore our conceptualization of power, we examine two existing phenomena that represent emerging educational trends: individualized educational programming within special education and clinical supervision. These examples illustrate the extent to which a reconceptualization of power as a system of facilitation provides a plausible explanation of power in educational settings, and is a

viable alternative paradigm that complements definitions of power as solely representing a hierarchical system of authority. We do not claim that facilitative power has or will replace authoritative power in educational organizations. Our intent is to add a chapter to, rather than rewrite the book of, power. Appreciating facilitation can help us comprehend ways in which the exercise of power has been changing in a growing number educational arenas.

The centrality of formal roles in defining power embodies an intellectual thesis which argues that authority structures [illegible]r actual influence and that power flows vertically (hierarchical authority). The traditional antitheses to this argument are that power is either (1) pervasive and no structure is needed (anarchism) or (2) that power is pervasive and all participants have an equal vote in decisions (participative democracy). Both of these counter arguments are extreme stances that seem administratively impractical. Neither argument reflects what occurs in most large complex organizations. While theories of hierarchical power continue to dominate our thinking, few argue that top-down hierarchies fully ore even adequately describe how power is actually exercised in schools.

II. Power in the Educational Administration Literature

An example of how writers about educational administration define power can be found in the American Educational Research Association's Handbook of Research on

Educational Administration (Boyan, 1987). In that handbook, Abbott and Caracheo (1987, p. 117) define power as:

> the most generic and most encompassing term in a conceptualization of domination in social interaction...a force that determines behavioral outcomes in an intended direction in a situation involving human interaction.

They argue that an individual or group does not have power, but rather exercises power when certain conditions exist. They acknowledge Weber's influence on their thinking, giving his definition of power "as every conceivable quality of person and every combination of circumstances that may put someone in a situation where he can demand compliance with his will" (Abbott and Caracheo, 1987, p. 117). They argue that the only two real sources of power in any organization are formal authority or prestige, and both are demonstrated only through dominance over others.[1] Abbott and Caracheo reflect the mainstream of sociological writings about power; their approach characterizes most traditional theories where power is defined as a system of authority. Their treatment is consistent with both the structural-functionalist normative theories of Durkheim, Weber, and Parsons, and the conflict theories of Hobbes and Marx. It also incorporates the more subtle distinctions Weber and others have made between power and authority. The emphasis of many modern writers (Blau & Scott, 1962; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Simon, 1957) on legitimate authority, that is, compliance through

willing suspension of judgment, also assumes power is a vertical phenomenon. Similarly, the interpretation of some organizational systems as sustaining legitimacy through shared norms (Etzioni, 1960) explains why individuals suspend judgment without questioning the top-down nature of organizational authority systems.

Abbott and Caracheo (1987, p. 294) concur with Weber and Russell that power is an aspect of most social relationships, but also argue that discussions of power should exclude purely "personal" aspects of power.

> It is important to make clear that we are discussing power in an institutional setting. We are not talking about power in informal groups, nor are we considering power a psychological phenomenon. The meaning of power in reference to a dyadic relationship would not be the same as its meaning in a formal organization or in a society as a whole (Abbott and Caracheo, 1987, p. 242).

They downgrade such social psychological approaches as Simmel's (1950) classical work on dyads and triads or Weick's (1979) discussion of organizing in which organizational phenomena are interpreted as magnified interpersonal and inter-group phenomena.

Most influential research in education is consistent with Abbott and Caracheo's definition: Dornbusch, et al. (1975) tied the exercise of authority to the right to evaluate; Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) defined power (which

usually resulted from resource acquisition) as the ability to obtain preferred outcomes; Muth's (1983) research on principals' power behaviors defined power as relational, potential, and probably asymmetical. Such definitions of organizational power acknowledge power as fundamentally relational and interactive, but find the demonstration of power only in overt acts of domination.

Historically, the primary alternative to power as domination in an authority system has been participatory management, sometimes expressed as classical European anarcho-syndicalism. The purely participative approach advocates employee election of management as well as policy development exercised through direct democracy (Bernstein, 1976; Zwerdling, 1980). This tradition, developed and sustained by employee ownership in the U.S. and Europe has relevance to current discussions about site-based management of schools. In a recent issue of the New York Times, education correspondent Edward Fiske (1990) talks about "teachers switching from order takers to decision-makers." Conley and Bacharach (1990) argue that site-based management will require not only more decentralized decision-making to the school building, but decentralization and participatory management at the school building. However, it is difficult to visualize as either a definition or as a prescriptive model for today's public schools. The burden of externally imposed regulations and policies makes fully independent schools virtually impossible. The expectations of parents

for a traditional symbol in the principalship also creates public relations issues. Teacher desires for classroom independence for themselves and for their colleagues also militate against full workplace democracy with explicit responsibility for professional peers. Because direct democracy necessarily increases meetings, it increases the time pressure most teachers already feel and increases uncertainty and ambiguity because democratic policy making is usually less stable and consistent than bureaucratic decree. As one teacher put it, "I would never go into a school which had a staffroom where every decision we made had to be by vote and we followed the vote" (Sikes, et al., 1985, p. 144).

The same facts of organizational life make anarchic alternatives infeasible. While definitions of power as a system of authority assume a gestalt of "top-downness," workplace democracy assumes an almost equally restrictive "bottom-upness," and anarchism allows no predictability at all. In practice, bottom-up systems, whether definable as formal or informal organization, serve as counter-balances, rather than as alternatives to, power exercised from the top down.

So what can practitioners and researchers use as a useful theoretical framework for examining current educational innovations? To explore this question, we first examine a narrow example, the special education I.E.P.

process, to illuminate the differences between authoritative and facilitative power.

III. Illustrative Example 1: Special Education and the I.E.P. Process

What is power in special education and how is it exercised? Special education, in the post-P.L. 94-142 era, provides an illustration of how the context and the reality of power in schools supports reconceptualizing power. Program design and delivery in special education stress an almost continuous interactive process of assessment and instruction. It frequently requires the integration of interdependent, and sometimes competing, professional expertise and political interests. Typically, regular classroom teachers refer, school psychologists assess, principals facilitate, and teams consisting of several professionals place students and evaluate progress through the I.E.P. (Individualized Educational Program) process. Specialists then deliver specific programs to individuals or to small groups of students inside or outside the regular classroom.

The I.E.P. process in special education has four singular features which have begun to spread to regular education as well. First, each situation--each child--is by definition special and unique, entitled to individual assessment and an individual program. With vague diagnostic categories, wide variation in labels from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and an imperfect fit between problems and

available programs, most special needs children become "projects," subject to meetings, negotiations, and decisions (Zeller, 1990).

Second, special education is visibly iterative, in that placement decisions are not final and have to be reviewed and renewed explicitly at least on an annual basis. Moreover, regular and special education teachers and parents monitor progress during each year, and adjustments or changes in placement and program frequently occur in mid-year. Special education has an indeterminate nature, as educators search for programs that will "work" for each individual student.

Third, the current emphasis on mainstreaming blurs the boundaries between regular and special education. Special educators stress each student's individuality, focussing on specific techniques for identifiable problems. Regular classroom teachers, by contrast, are by necessity group oriented and norm-driven. Increasing use of consulting, where specialists work with teachers rather than directly with students requires teachers to share space and students (West & Idol, 1987). Collaboration brings both tensions and opportunities as teachers seek to negotiate latent and manifest differences in pedogogic style and instructional philosophy, and learn for themselves how to work as a team rather than alone with students.

Fourth, special education is explicitly and implicitly a political process to which participants bring special

rights and resources not always present in other educational settings. The I.E.P. process requires consensus: each participant must agree with the I.E.P. and affix his or her signature to the final document. While this regulation was designed to protect parents' and children's rights, it also gives teachers and specialists leverage. The ability to participate actively in the process is reinforced by expertise in special education and familiarity with the law. To summarize, special education has become an open and continual political process that has multi-directional, multi-dimensional inputs and broad-based legitimacy rather than a decision structure amenable to authoritative, top-down power.

Theories requiring the exercise of authoritative power do not fit these circumstances. Building administrators have difficulty developing and implementing policies in a top-down fashion where exception is the rule and where circumstances encourage deference to staff expertise. is the norm. While principals assume responsibility for special services in their buildings, they are limited in their power because specialists are often itinerant, and report both to central office special education administration and to the building principals where their programs are housed (Lietz & Towle, 1979; Sage & Burrello, 1986). Central office staff may not be well informed about specific circumstances in each school building. Building administrators, seldom trained in special education, are typically not

knowledgeable about current legal and programmatic issues (Davis, 1980; Clarke, 1984). Neither building nor central administration has complete control, and often they are competitive with one another to the detriment of staff relations on-site and also of service to students. Facilitation to build cooperation between building and district headquarters and between specialists and generalists working at the same site is the ideal process for effectively achieving mutually acceptable educational goals.

In effect, no one has power and everyone has power. Successful special education programs have participants who use one another creatively and efficiently. Administrators provide resources, including space and funds for programs and meetings. Specialists provide expertise and, because they are itinerant, networks. Classroom teachers provide a willingness to disrupt routines and to do new learning on behalf of individual students. Parents and advocates provide energy that prods the system into action. Goodwill, trust, reciprocity, and compromise are parts of the process because special education requires constant adjustments and many formal meetings. Arranging combinations of people who can work effectively with one another is a key component of facilitation in special education, even more than in other types of educational programs. Facilitative power includes garnering external resources; buffering problems coming from central administration, parents, or the public; and

providing staff development in collaborative skills. It is particularly appropriate, and perhaps even necessary, for educating special needs children.

To make this imagery more concrete, consider special education as a professional process. It consists of three interrelated activities: needs assessment, resource allocation through assignment of children and professional staff, and program delivery. These activities are implicitly professional and technical, and can operate independently of formal power. Needs assessment is a process that is both knowledge-based and collegial. It brings together those parents and teachers who know individual students intimately with specialists in language, movement, and psychology. The specialists bring different disciplinary and experiential expertise to the discussions of each student's needs. Actual meetings have political overtones in that participants are influenced by administrators' right to accept or veto team decisions and by team members' often competing paradigms. Nevertheless, needs assessment is ideally technical and rational. The process represents collegial professionalism in its generic form: individuals collectively and cooperatively apply their knowledge of general phenomena in their own specialty to an individual student. Whether the supervising administrator is a special education director or the principal, the administrative role is relatively small.

Resource allocation is similarly professionally embedded. Administrators are responsible for staff assignments, but these are incidental to group assessments of individual children. In fact, I.E.P. teams are inclusive and often invite additional participation. It might even be argued that the advocacy potential of special education may increase the extent of professional practice by requiring staff to bring professionally justifiable evidence to their shared perceptions. Resource allocation may be administered by a hierarchically identified leader, but he or she is to represent the consensus of the I.E.P. team. This responsibility requires skills in both facilitation and negotiation. Agreement may not be complete, the match between available programs and identified needs imperfect, and resources may be short.

As program delivery moves towards the consultant model described by West and Idol (1987), cooperation and coordination become more complicated. Regular classroom teachers must familiarize themselves with the special educator's craft and must learn to work with one or more peer experts as well as with special needs pupils. Special educators reverse the process; they must understand the dynamics of regular classrooms. The learning is mutual and interactive, but it is easy to visualize as much resistance to as acceptance of change (Sarason, 1982). Collaboration is a negotiated process rather than one that can be mandated

from above. Effective solutions to problems will reflect individual teacher and student needs more than system needs.

These three aspects of special education are never independent of one another. While program delivery in special education, including actual instruction and associated services, is most significant in terms of elapsed time, identification and allocation are ongoing as professional staff monitor the child's progress and, less frequently, consider the program options for the next academic year. Similarly, assessment and identification of handicapping conditions takes place with resources and program delivery in mind because of the tendency for solutions--in this case staff expertise and training--to seek out appropriate problems to fit them.

Our argument that "power as facilitation" describes both what is occurring and what probably should occur in special education is relatively new. However, the prescriptive literature and several research studies on special education administration support the facilitative approach to power. In the NAASP Bulletin, Margaret Leibfried (1984) stressed the principal's role in fostering and facilitating staff acceptance of mainstreaming. More recently, Brennan and Brennan (1988) in the same journal urged principals to develop a deeper understanding of the goals, needs, and motivations of those involved in special education and to be guided by "situational ethics." By this they appear to recommend recognition of the uniqueness of

virtually every special education situation, and to prefer making judgments by broad principles rather than by bureaucratic formulae. McCoy (1981) emphasizes the interface between student needs and staff abilities and needs. Similarly Conoley (1982) argues that small schools are especially appropriate for special education placements because principal leadership can facilitate staff interaction, team teaching, and shared leadership.

Research reports support these prescriptions. Lietz and Kaiser (1979) found that faculty-administration relationships and delivery of services to educationally handicapped children were correlated. Reporting on two studies in Ontario, Trider and Leithwood (1988) found that "empowered" patterns of school administration were related to implementation of special education policy. Finally, in studying two schools for severely retarded children, Cherniss (1988) reported that staff burnout was less frequent in a building where the principal spent less time in classroom observations, more time planning and coordinating activities, interacted more with her own superior, and discussed work-related problems more than administrative issues. The research would seem to support the view that special education involves staff who are active, reactive, and hands-on in matching policies to individual student situations and programs.

<u>What is Power When Everyone Has Some?</u>

This brings us back to the question with which we began this section: what is power in special education and how is it exercised? Pfeffer (1981, p. 3) urges us to recognize and measure power by "the ability of those who possess power to bring about the outcomes they desire". His work on power in organizations helps crystalize and sharpen issues. Like Abbott and Caracheo, Pfeffer's approach incorporates structure and function, and deals with consensus and conflict. His discussion incorporates two significant issues: the presumed ability of those with power to overcome the resistance of others and the ability to obtain preferred outcomes where there is uncertainty or dissensus about choices (Pfeffer, 1981: 3-7). However, implicit in his argument is the assumption that there <u>are</u> preferred outcomes that may be represented by decisions. In special education this frequently is not the case, since policy is so often overwhelmed by the exceptions that characterize the field.

Power in special education, and perhaps in schools generally, is clearly not only, or not even primarily, the ability to enforce policies or even to "get results." Rather, it is the ability to help a group of professionals integrate their respective expertise to resolve an iterative series of complex, often intractable, problems. The many complicating issues make authoritative administration extremely difficult. The individualized nature of pupil needs in special education argues for multiple inputs. The peculiarities of any particular school site make

prototypically top-down administration virtually impossible. Moreover, the different paradigms by which special and regular education teachers may have been trained argues for facilitative rather than authoritative leadership. Even delegation downward may not substantially improve professional practice without a facilitative structure that puts student assignments, team composition, program delivery, and budget allocation into teachers' and other specialists' hands so that they may use their collective expertise to empower one another.

Current educational innovations (for example instructional leadership, site-based management, mainstreaming, clinical supervision, etc.) promise changes for teacher and administrator professionalism and for school organization itself in ways that may extend well beyond the shifting of specific contested spheres. These movements use professional knowledge as a source of internal political power. The new knowledge and skills, however, may only serve to highlight areas of ignorance, curiously increasing interdependency, the need for trust, and the desirability of facilitative management. They also threaten a status quo based on autonomous spheres, defined professionally and organizationally, and on the organizational symbol structure rooted deeply in the experience and tradition of American schools.

Before pursuing further the issue of power and its relation to educational professionalism, let us examine a

second example of current educational practice: clinical supervision.

IV. Illustrative Example 2: Clinical Supervision

Supervision of teaching is a second area of school life where alternative, conflicting definitions of power are in use. The unresolved issues about whether supervision can contain formative, supportive, and summative judgments simultaneously in the same process provide a second illustration of how embedded concepts of power affect individuals' ability to change practices.

Recent writing about school supervision advocates organizational systems where teaching methods, supervisory systems, curriculum, and schedules are linked tightly together and are driven by a "one best knowledge" about learning and teaching (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Glickman, 1990). These theoretical approaches to supervision are driven by a larger overall vision of education and are generally compatible with thinking about power as a system of authority. The first such models to receive widespread attention were developed by Goldhammer, Cogan and others in the Harvard education programs of the late 1950's and early 1960's. Robert Goldhammer, refining earlier conceptualizations by Morris Cogan, published the first widely used "clinical supervision" methodology (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, et al., 1980). Goldhammer and Cogan proposed and tested a five step supervision cycle:

pre-observation conference, observation of teaching, analysis and strategy development, supervision conference, and postconference analysis. They argued that building principals who wanted to be called "instructional leaders" would need to spend at least half of their time engaged in activities related to curriculum, supervision, and general teacher development (research on common practice at that time indicated most principals spent only 10-12 percent of their time on curricular interactions with teachers); most interactions were in groups and did not include direct classroom supervision. While Goldhammer argued that clinical supervision could include group supervision between several supervisors and a teacher, he also argued that most supervision actually occurred at a distance without development of trust, mutual goals, or opportunities for interactions between respectful professionals. Goldhammer, Cogan, Acheson and Gall, and others argued that the only way to move to improved classroom performance was through a prescribed cycle that was predictable for both the supervisor and the supervisee, and included opportunities for input from both parties.

The primary difficulty with the clinical supervision approach in practice is that it leaves the judgment and "coaching" of classroom performance in the hands of (1) a person who is not necessarily expert in and familiar with good classroom strategies and (2) a person who also makes summary judgments about merit, including decisions about

tenure for probationary teachers. Principals, whose most recent training is necessarily in administration and whose administrative duties are fulltime, typically spend limited time teaching in classrooms. While supervision was improved by codification into clinical programs, procedures, and strategies, it continued to embrace the at least dual role of coach and judge in the same person. The fact that the principal might or might not be a capable teacher added to the problem of establishing an atmosphere that fulfilled the dual charges of assisting development and judging competency.

This role complexity is mirrored in Sergiovanni and Starratt's (1979, p. 305) definition of clinical supervision.

> Clinical supervision] refers to face-to-face encounters with teachers about teaching, usually in classrooms, with the double-barreled intent of professional development and improvement of instruction.

"Encounters" that are "double-barreled" typically do not give supervisees a "safe" environment in which they may expose weaknesses in teaching and seek assistance. Instead, the language mirrors the "power over" aspects of judgment and encourages teachers to perform only to expectations and to conceal weaknesses. This behavior satisfies the need for top down judgment at the sacrifice of a collegial atmosphere conducive to further development of teaching skills.

The clinical supervision movement also made progress in distinguishing direct supervision of teaching from the broader issue of general supervision. None of its proponents, however, were successful in removing the power-as-authority aspect of the summary judgments that inevitably reside in the superordinate position. Even where a curriculum director or other administrator is directed to do the actual supervision, direction comes typically from the principal and combines both formative and summative functions within the purview of a single actor.

Even less successful in actual practice than the clinical supervision models were efforts to encourage informal teacher sharing in order to improve teaching. Team teaching, "schools within the school," "family grouping," etc. were all tried, but were then typically relegated to the category of "nice but generally ineffectual" informal approaches. The way these approaches to collegial (participatory) supervision are generally dismissed is typified by Sergiovanni and Starratt:

> Informal staff-development approaches should be encouraged and supported. Indeed, the benefits derived from such approaches are a good reason for supervisors and administrators to advocate patterns of instruction which encourage teachers to plan and work together. Team teaching, schools within the school, and family grouping are examples of arrangements which naturally stimulate informal

staff-development activities (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1979: 296).

These models of voluntary "participatory supervision" echo the antithetical argument of participatory power described in the first section of this paper. Attempts to establish peer supervision have largely been written off as less powerful in improving teaching in desired directions than clinical supervision of teachers performed by capable administrators. Peer consultation oriented towards teacher-directed professional development has been more successful in fostering collegial exchange (Smith, 1989). These methods do not address existing systemic requirements for summary judgments, making peer consultation an activity with different dynamics and consequences, and avoiding rather than resolving issues of power.

The relationship between informal processes and the embedded concepts of authoritative power provides a contrast to Abbott and Caracheo's (1987: 242) more limited definition of power as it is displayed in organizations. They specifically exclude "psychological" phenomena, informal groups, and "dyadic relationships." However, the dyadic relationship implicit in supervisory encounters contains both personal and structural power. In clinical supervision, it makes no sense to use definitions so narrow they exclude, personal, dyadic, or informal interactions.

Conventional definitions of power include relational and interactive elements, yet retain coercion as the

essential ingredient of all power interactions. These definitions limit our ability to describe want can occur in collegial supervision or, more generally, to predict acts between professionals within bureaucracies. For example, problems observed in clinical supervision have been interpreted as the result of inadequate process or poorly prepared supervisors. Good and Brophy (1973), among others, have argued that teachers not only do not mind supervision of their teaching, but will seek evaluation, if "effective and useful methods are available." However, no amount of improved process or better prepared supervisors can get around the problem of including a final summary judgment in the same act of supervision as an attempt to coach to improved practice. The problem is in "more effective methods," but in separating the power of authority from the facilitative intent to improve practice.

As the prescriptive literature on teacher and principal professionalism changes how we represent and interpret authority systems and can further illuminate this area (Ogawa and Bossert, 1989). If we think of supervision as primarily a counseling and support act, authoritative imagery is inimical instead of helpful. Many of today's arguments about "instructional leadership" focus on the need for the new school leader to support instructional excellence. This is best accomplished when the school leader is also a master teacher, and when teachers being supervised have confidence that the is highly competent.

Meanwhile, the demand for professional school administrators to be good managers has not decreased in the face of increased demands for teaching and supervisory skills. Now, we expect administrators to become better supervisors because they are good managers and good teachers. Instead of solving the summative-formative problem, we have simply added more requirements to the already long list of necessary or desirable skills.

Acheson (1990), Joyce and Showers (1987), and Schön (1987) argue for reflective and peer supervisory models that separate acts of evaluative judgment for merit and promotion, from supervision for improvement of teaching or for teacher motivation and support. All tasks must be performed, but each must be achieved and perceived separately so that authoritative judgmental power does not preclude more collegial and supportive exchanges. When separate, the professional power of the administrator to help with teaching is exercised through the professional power of the teacher. The latter can accept that assistance only when there is little or no fear of subsequent negative evaluation resulting from expressing an area of teaching weakness. Improvement of teaching occurs only when the authority encourages improvement of teaching. Power in this instance lies in professional knowledge and expert counseling skills, not in coercion or prestige as contained within traditional definitions of power. Power defined as coercion explains some events, and informal participative

power describes others. However, neither captures the essence of professionalism fully practiced.

Power and Professionalism

Both special education and clinical supervision demonstrate ways in which organizational power and professional actualization and integrity may be in conflict. The sociological literature is persuasive, of course, that professional expertise and behavioral codes clash frequently with bureaucratic preferences for standardization and budgetary control (Friedson, 1986: 158-84). That tradition, however, often focuses more on professional ideologies than on the work professionals do or on the circumstances of that work. In schools, teaching requires situational autonomy and judgmental discretion. Solutions, or even approaches, to problems of individual and group learning usually are not reducible to standardized formulae. Teachers are often more concerned with having autonomy in problem solving than they are about more general matters of curricular policy and content. Problem solving, however, introduces tactical issues not amenable to top-down exercise of authority.

Significantly, teachers and administrators have become more professional as their knowledge base has become larger and more sophisticated and as educational specialties have become more specialized and differentiated. Training times have increased for entry programs and continuing education. Professional self-consciousness has grown as the major teacher unions have become, paradoxically, both more

entrenched and legitimate, while at the same time becoming visible proponents of reform (Soltis, 1987). Specific knowledge and certification provides power sources that are external to schools yet are exercised within them.

However, a narrow focus on professionalism de-emphasizes interdependences between teachers and administrators. Research on effective, excellent, and exemplary schools and on school improvement has highlighted these relationships (Austin & Garber, 1985). Teachers and administrators are typically not collaborative. Teachers historically not only have been vigilant in protecting the integrity of their own classrooms, but have been unwilling to trespass on those of their colleagues. Teachers and administrators frequent misunderstand one another's actions and needs and compete in "contested spheres" (Hanson, 1985). This occurs also between teachers with different specialties (Kerr, 1985).

Yet, schools struggle with increasing student diversity, the intrusion of family and community problems into schools, mainstreaming of handicapped children, and other educational dilemmas. This means that school staffs spend less time and effort on "normal" children making regular progress and more time and effort on "exceptions," that is with children having special needs and not making regular progress. Correspondingly, collaboration and coordination become much more necessary than when educators assumed bureaucratic approaches would be acceptable. With

more demands and more complex problems, top-down, authoritative power is not sufficient to solve problems.

Educational reform creates more professional tools and more professional interdependencies. Instead of formulating policies and mandating compliance, administrators can use power to broker interim solutions and later adaptations. This more facilitative approach to using power allows educators to use one another's knowledge without necessarily sharing expertise, knowledge bases, and assumptions. It encourages recognition that there may be multiple solutions to complex educational problems. Problem solving becomes more mutual and can be negotiated on the basis of collegial, reciprocal norms. School leaders can help provide resources--human and material--that make their staffs more effective individually by using one another's knowledge and skills. They can use their formal positions of power to establish and maintain conditions where others can solve problems. Thus, organizational power and professional actualization can complement and serve one another. Facilitation from above can promote effective professional problem solving which, in turn, provides solutions that are effective enough to free administrators from interminable trouble shooting so that they can continue to facilitate further problem-solving.

As leaders manage, lead, coach, evaluate, mediate, and coordinate as well as continuing to provide the visible symbol of value and virtue demanded today, then they sort

through issues of authority and power with those they wish to lead. Instead of a top-down authority structure with activities of those on the bottom directed to those on the top, new organizational and symbolic structures have begun to afford opportunities for power-as-facilitation. As in special education, roles can be negotiated to meet a mutually desirable end goal.

V. Interpretations and Conclusions

Kanter (1989) argues that in the complex, interdependent, highly networked corporate world, giants must now learn to dance with one another. This is no less true of educators who, by traditional preference, have valued and defended independence and autonomy. And educators have been learning to dance. The examples of special education and clinical supervision provide two examples of power as a system of facilitation in which professional power is exercised and actualized through others on the basis of trust and reciprocity. This type of power, involving a relationship between professionals who behave as peers rather than as superiors or subordinates, is accurately described as facilitative rather than as authoritative, democratic, or anarchic.

Power as a system of facilitation can be added to more traditional conceptualizations to provide a more useful conceptual frame for practitioners and researchers. As we have presented it here, facilitative power appears to have two signal additive characteristics.

First, facilitative power apparently both decentralizes and enlarges the decision-making process by incorporating more active involvement by more actors. Where facilitation is the dominant mode of administrative behavior, it generally involves efforts to increase the autonomy and decision-making capability of professional staff who both frame problems and attempt to develop solutions. Implicitly, facilitation presumes that the quality of many educational efforts can be improved by bringing choices closer to problems and closer to the professionals who will actually implement specific decisions in classrooms and elsewhere. However, at least in activities that have specifically legal ramifications, decisions must still be ratified by those who have legal authority as a consequence of their formal roles. However, negotiations can be conducted through facilitative processes rather than as reaffirmations of domination or of positional authority. What occurs in these two areas resembles a "negotiated order" very comparable to that which Strauss and his colleagues (1963) found in their research on hospitals.

Second, facilitative systems appear to encourage non-standardized approaches to and solutions of problems. Facilitation encourages actors to treat each situation as unique, even if the problem-solving process can be routinized through explicit formats such as I.E.P. meetings. Moreover, specific [illegible]tions are functions of actors, individually and collectively, rather than on functions of a

bureaucratic system or even problems themselves. Individuals or teams rely on their knowledge, skills, and experience to define specific educational problems and propose solutions rather than giving priority to precedent or aligning themselves to what others are doing. This also is relative, and may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. There are likely several professionally appropriate courses of action for any given student, classroom, or building problem. Where this is the case, professional solutions may be most effective when they are aligned with characteristics of professionals who deliver services as well as with characteristics of children experiencing problems. There is some danger of professionals starting with solutions rather than problems, that is, seeking problems that fit the solutions they have on hand. Both special education and clinical supervision, however, do have an accountability framework that provides controls. At least one researcher has suggested that superiors' reliance on professional autonomy appears to improves performance as well as motivation (Raelin, 1986).

Moreover, we can anticipate that experiments with site-basing decisions will accelerate already existing trends that reduce standardization within and across districts. In practice, school staffs strive to match mandated educational programs to specific local characteristics of students, teachers, and communities. Environmental pressures often force these changes. Community and parental pressure

increasingly influences the adoption or termination of curricular and other programs. Current federal policy in special education, for example, with its emphasis on individual programming combined with mainstreaming, increases variance within and between classrooms and schools, thereby reducing educators' ability to standardize assessment and program delivery. A second example is clinical supervision. While there are several widely used models of clinical supervision (Acheson & Gall, Hunter's ITIP, etc.) actual practice of any model varies substantially from site to site and supervisor to supervisor. The movements away from standardization in both special education and clinical supervision, combined with site-based restructuring activities, increase the likelihood that neither top-down power nor participatory democracy can *adequately explain successful practice at any given site.*

We have left at least two issues unexplored in our discussion of power. What occurs in special education and supervision may or may not be typical of all educators' professional activities. I.E.P. meetings and supervisory observations, however characterized, are intrinsically interactive and require meetings. Yet, in terms of time, they are usually a small part of what most teachers and administrators do. While we can anticipate that school restructuring will encourage more activities where teachers share time, space, and students--factors that require some collaboration and benefit from external facilitation--to

date, only a minority of teachers are currently required to work closely with others while performing their core professional activities.

Finally, the growth of facilitative power may have effects on school administrators, especially principals, that are difficult to predict in this era of potential reform. Special education, an area of little interest and training for many administrators, does not provide a strong test of the effects of movement towards more facilitative administration. Most principals have been happy to delegate special education and to broker resource allocation issues. Clinical supervision is more complex and problematic because principals vary profoundly in their desire and ability to use clinical supervision as a mode of instructional leadership and school improvement. It is an issue in which the tension between evaluation and improvement is necessarily sharp. However, if the use of facilitative power contributes to a cumulative reduction in administrators' formal authority, it will also likely reduce the degree to which they are at the visible center of schools. They may become less able to intervene in professional issues, and consequently less directly responsible for either school success or school failure. Given that both motivation and reward systems for school administrators emphasize their traditional centrality, fully facilitative power systems may force school leaders to

redefine the types of ego rewards they can expect to experience.

In this paper, we have argued that thinking of power only as authoritative and coercive unnecessarily limits our ability to describe how power is exercised in today's schools. Thinking of power as primarily facilitative and interactive does not preclude authoritative, vertically-oriented power, but places the latter lower in the rankings of effective techniques for working with other educational professionals. Facilitative power does not imply abdication of control, a characteristic of fully equalitarian structures. Instead, it emphasizes the potential of maximizing problem solving capabilities by incorporating more of the professional skills available in educational organizations.

[1] In developing their definition of power, Abbott and Caracheo (1987: 243) collapse French and Raven's oft-cited categorization of power (legitimate, reward, punishment, referent and expert) to the two bases of authority and prestige. They argue that reward and punishment are an exercise of power rather than a base of power, and therefore are of a different order than the other definitions given. They agree with French and Raven that legitimate power is authority. Referent power and expert power are seen as types of prestige, defined by Abbott and Caracheo as individual power through personal attributes. These might

include, for instance, identification, expertness, intelligence, ability to lead, and past service record. They conclude that the only two bases of power, therefore, are formal authority and prestige within the organization.

"facilitative power..." - p. 36

References

Abbott, M. G. & Caracheo, F. (1987). Power, Authority, and Bureaucracy. Pp. 239-58 in Boyan, N., ed. (1987). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. NY: Longman.

Acheson, K. (1990). Evaluating, Supervising and Analyzing Teaching. Eugene: Oregon School Study Council Report.

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. M. (1987). Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications, 2nd Edition. New York: Longman.

Austin, G. R. & Garber, I. I. (1985). Research on Exemplary Schools. NY: Academic Press.

Bernstein, Paul (1976). Workplace Democratization: Its Internal Dynamics. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Blau, P. & Scott, W. R. (1962). Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler.

Boyan, N., ed. (1987). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. NY: Longman.

Brennan, A. D. H. & Brennan, R. J. (1988). The Principal, Ethics, and Special Education Decisions. NASSP Bulletin 72 (Dec.): 16-19.

Cherniss, C. (1988). Observed Supervisory Behavior and Teacher Burnout in Special Education. Exceptional Children 54: 449-54.

Clarke, B. R. (1984). The Role of the Principal in Mainstreaming. British Columbia Journal of Special Education 8: 247-55.

Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Conley, S. C. & Bacharach, S. B. (1990). From School-Site Management to Participatory School-Site Management. Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March): 539-44.

Conoley, J. (1982). Small Schools Have Great Potential For Effective Mainstreaming. Small School Forum 4 (Fall): 3-5.

Davis, W. E. (1980). An Analysis of Principal's Formal Training in Special Education. Education 101 (Fall): 89-94.

Dornbusch, S., Scott, W. R., Laing, J. & Busching, B. (1975). Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Etzioni, A. (1960). A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press.

Fiske, E. B. (1990). Lessons. New York Times (May 2): B6.

Friedson, E. (1986). Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach, 2nd Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

"facilitative power..." - p. 38

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision. Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers, 2nd Edition. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. (1973). Looking in Classrooms. NY: Harper & Row.

Hanson, E. M. (1985). Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (1987). Educational Administration, 3rd ed. New York: Random House.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1987). Student Achievement Through Staff Development. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Kanter, R. M. (1989). When Giants Learn to Dance: Mastering the Challenges of Strategy, Management, and Careers in the 1990's. NY: Simon & Shuster.

Kerr, S. T. (1985). Referral in Education and Medicine. Work and Occupations 12: 416-36.

Leibfried, M. (1984). Improving One's Attitudes toward Special Education Programs: The Principal's Role Is Instrumental. NASSP Bulletin 68 (November): 110-13.

Lewis, A. (1989). Restructuring America's Schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Lietz, J. & Kaiser, J. S. (1979). The Principal's Role in Administering Programs for Exceptional Children. Education 100 (Fall): 31-40.

Lietz, J.J. & Towle, M. (1979). The Principal's Role in Special Education Services. Educational Research Quarterly 4 (Fall): 12-20.

McCoy, K. M. (1981). The Role of the Mainstream Principal. Education 102 (Winter): 165-69.

Murphy, J. F. (1990). R ructuring Schools: Capturing the Phenomena. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

O'Neil, J. (1990). Piecing Together the Restructuring Puzzle. Educational Leadership 47 (April): 4-10.

Ogawa, R. T. & Bossert, S. T. (1989). Leadership: A Quality of Organization, Not Individuals. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the AERA, San Francisco.

Parsons, T.

Pitner, N. B. (1982). Training of the School Administrator: State of the Art. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy & Management.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Co.

Raelin, J. A. (1986). The Clash of Culture: Managers and Professionals. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.

Russell, B. (1963). Power, a New Social Analysis. New York: Norton.

Sage, D. D. & Burrello, L. C. (1986). Policy and Management in Special Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Salancik, J. & Pfeffer, J. (1978).

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, 2nd Edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schön, D. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1979). Supervision: Human Perspectives, 2nd Edition. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Sikes, P. J., Measor, L. & Woods, P. (1985). Teacher Careers: Crises and Commitments. London: Falmer Press.

Simmel G. (1950). The Sociology of Georg Simmel, ed. and trans. by K. H. Wolff. New York: Free Press.

Simon, H. (1957). Administrative Behavior. New York: Free Press.

Smith, N. S. (1989). Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Soltis, J. (ed.) (1987). Reforming Teacher Education. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Ehrlich, D., Bucher, R., & Sabshin, M. (1963). The Hospital and its Negotiated Order. Pp. 147-69 of E. Friedson (ed.), The Hospital in Modern Society. NY: Free Press.

Trider, D. M. & Leithwood, K. A. (1988). Exploring the Influences on Principal Behavior. Curriculum Inquiry 18: 289-311.

Weick, K. (1979). The Social Psychology of Organizing. : Addison-Wesley.

West, J. F. & Idol, L. (1987). School consultation (Part I): An interdisciplinary perspective on theory, models, and research. Journal of Learning Disabilities 20: 388-408.

Will, M. (1988). Educating Students with Learning Problems and the Changing Role of the School Psychologist. School Psychology Review 17: 476-78.

Zeller, R. (1990). An Investigation of Influences on the Patterns of Special Education Placement for Culturally and Ethnically Different Students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Zwerdling, D. (1980). Workplace Democracy. NY: Harper Colophon.